

of which it appears that the Lord never "allows" to be paid, the vast aggregates which have been so loudly advertised are misleading. It is a kind of pious lying, apologized for by the old fashioned logic that the end justifies the means. Others, reading of such vast liberality, will be encouraged or constrained to swell their contributions. There seems to be an exuberant poetic license in the make up of the Rev. Mr. Simpson, which may account for these sensational collection statements. For example, in his sermon at the Nyak convention occurs the following passage: "Paul arose at the beckoning of God and left the great churches with their frescoed walls, their foliated pillars, their cushioned seats, and went into far heathen lands. When the church at Rome invited him to pay a visit he replied: 'I should like to call in and see you, my friends, but I shall never set foot in Rome again as long as there is a heathen unconverted.'"

This is eloquence, but not truth. Of course it didn't happen, but then if it helped the collection, why quibble about a little historical fib? We have nothing in the world to say against any man who is honestly trying to do good, but when a journal of the dignity, intelligence and veracity of *The Independent* persistently calls attention to the serious irregularities of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, and of Mr. Simpson's management in particular, it is time for sensible people to pause and consider. There never was a man so high or so holy that he could claim, and demand, and exercise the exclusive and unquestionable control of immense funds, without any responsibility to anybody, and without the duty of rendering an account. This is precisely the scheme of Dr. Dowie and Mr. Simpson, and when, as in the case of the latter, his missionaries complain that the money does not reach them, and when as *The Independent* asserts and proves, that numbers of these missionaries are reduced to starvation in a foreign land, and, as at least in one case, insanity and suicide was the result of this neglect, sensible people are forced to the conclusion that there is a colored man in the woodpile, somewhere. Beware of irresponsible men, men who have no credentials, and particularly the kind who take the ground that they are not bound to render an account to anybody. The Brethren church has suffered from men of this stripe, suffered enough, and it is with the view of safeguarding the churches in the future against the damage it has sustained in the past that earnest men have been led to inquire whether or not the association of churches hasn't fundamental, scriptural right to determine the question of ministerial credentials, and to regulate any man, no matter who or where he is, who as a preacher or a pastor sets up

the mourners' bench, or does anything else which is a damage, not only to his own church, but to the *whole church*. The fact that as a pastor I may set up some practice in my church, but by the consent of my church, which would result in damaging the influence and hindering the growth of every church in the district, or association, implies, in many minds, a fundamental right upon the part of the association to take measures for its own protection, and to institute preventive as well as corrective measures. I may, for example, believe in the mourners' bench, and it may work no particular damage to my church, but if circumstances make my use of it a hindrance and a damage to other churches, there ought on the one hand to be a tribunal which can take official cognizance of that fact, and on the other hand I, as a Christian, ought cheerfully yield a mere question of expediency to the general good. No man lives or dies to himself, and neither does any church.

THE PASSOVER QUESTION

J. H. SWIHART

Brother Gnagey:—It has been a long time since I wrote for the columns of the good old EVANGELIST; not because I had no interest in its productions, but because there are so many more able writers keeping it well filled with good spiritual food, so I thought my productions might not be of much interest to the readers, but now since the passover question is up again, do let me ask a few questions, which I hope the editor or some other brother will see fit to answer.

Turning to Matthew 26:17-21, Mark 14:13-18 and Luke 22:7-14, we learn that Christ did actually command his disciples to make ready the Passover, and adds, "that we may eat."

1. My first question is this: Was the Passover as mentioned by the three evangelists, and which Christ bade them prepare, the legal or some other Passover?

2. If the Passover referred to in the foregoing question was not the legal Passover, what Passover was it?

3. If the Passover, as mentioned by Matthew, Mark and Luke was the legal Passover, did not Christ eat of it in the night of his betrayal with his disciples?

4. If Christ did not eat of the Passover in the night he was betrayed, what object had he to order it prepared that they *might* eat?

5. Where is the Scripture to be found that teaches directly or indirectly that Christ did *not* eat of the legal Passover, i. e., the lamb ordered to be slain, with his disciples in the large upper room in Jerusalem at the very time that he instituted footwashing the Lord's Supper and the communion?

Once more, was it not necessary that Christ who was "made under the law,"

should obey its precepts: hence keep the Passover; and did not the great Law Giver have power and a perfect right to partake of this feast twenty-four hours in advance of the Jewish time; that he might so fulfill the law, so as to render it possible to become the *end* of the law by his death on the cross at the exact time ordained of God.

Pennington, Ark.

DR. TALMAGE AND TRIUNE IMMERSION

J. B. WAMPLER

Some persons seem to doubt that Dr. Talmage administered a three-fold dipping, and a face forward action in the case of Ulysses Grant Houston of Manhattan, Kansas, on December 6, 1898. As illustrated and published in an editorial by the Dr. himself and contained in *The Christian Herald* and *Signs of Our Times*, Vol. XIII, No. 12, Wednesday, March 19, 1890, I quote *verbatim et literatim* from the editorial as follows: "It was a solemn scene; even the Shiek was affected by it. To the surprise of the Americans he prostrated himself on the earth and prayed to Allah, as if the Spirit of worship could not be resisted. As the singing ceased he rose and closely watched the ceremony. Dr. Talmage then led in prayer, invoking the divine presence and blessing. Opening his Bible he then read from the third chapter of Matthew the account of the baptism of Jesus. The customary questions to the candidate were asked, and satisfactory answers were given. Dr. Talmage then read his commission in Matt. 28:19, 20, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, etc. Looking the candidate squarely in the face, Dr. Talmage said: "In this historic river which parted three times to let God's people pass dry shod, in which Naaman plunged seven times for healing from dire disease, and from the banks of which Elijah ascended in equipage of fire, and in which Christ was baptized, and which for ages has been the symbol of the division between earth and heaven. I baptize thee." Then taking the candidate by the hand, he led him into the water. Reaching a sufficient depth he immersed him three separate times, repeating the usual formula: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." After which he pronounced the benediction. At the close of the ceremony Dr. Talmage said: "As the ordinance was observed under the direction of no particular denomination of Christians, and no particular church could be responsible for it I feel it my duty to report what I did to the church universal."

I addressed Dr. Talmage personally interrogating him in reference to the number of actions and posture of this